NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<table>
<tr><td>RIGOBERTO ROSALES; et al.,

        Petitioners,

  v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

        Respondent.</td><td>No. 04-72721

Agency Nos. A75-724-298
               A75-724-299

MEMORANDUM [*]</td></tr>
</table>

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted March 8, 2006 [**]

Before: CANBY, BEEZER, and KOZINSKI, Circuit Judges.

Rigoberto Rosales and Ana Rosales, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition

for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' summary affirmance of an

---

    [*]   This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be
cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

    [**]   The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

immigration judge's denial of their applications for cancellation of removal. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252.

Although we lack jurisdiction to review the IJ's determination regarding "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship," *Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 890 (9th Cir. 2003), we nonetheless retain jurisdiction to determine whether the IJ's interpretation of the hardship standard violates due process, *Ramirez-Perez v. Ashcroft*, 336 F.3d 1001, 1004 (9th Cir. 2003). Reviewing de novo, we conclude that the IJ's interpretation of the hardship standard falls within the broad range authorized by the statute. *See id*. at 1006.

We further conclude that the IJ did not violate due process in voicing skepticism regarding the testimony of petitioners' medical expert because the IJ ultimately considered the evidence and concluded that petitioners failed to establish eligibility for relief. *See Sanchez-Cruz v. INS*, 255 F.3d 775, 779 (9th Cir. 2001) (requiring prejudice to establish a due process violation during immigration proceedings).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.